



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,118	12/17/2001	Masahiro Yanagi	1614.1205	4188

21171 7590 02/25/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BELL, PAUL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/016,118

Applicant(s)

YANAGI, MASAHIRO

Examiner

PAUL A BELL

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2003.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-13 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-13 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 7-10 recite the limitation "The input device as claimed in claim 5" , in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim because claim 5 was canceled by applicant .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 6, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneider et al. (6,356,243).

With regard to claim 1, Schneider teaches an input device (figure 2a, item 210) in that an input part for inputting information is accommodated in a housing there of (column 5, lines 21-28, figure2a item 215), said input device comprising an antenna arranged at an upper surface inside said housing and emitting a radio wave based on input information generated by said input part (figure 2a clearly shows dotted lines indicating the antenna item 240 inside the housing and column 5, lines 20-65) wherein said housing comprises: a case and an upper cover (figure 2a, item 215 teaches the outer surface of the device with electronics an antenna inside and since there is a solid line running semi vertical on the surface, let left of line be called the cover and right of

Art Unit: 2675

line be called case and further it is inherent that there would be a means of getting the electronics inside the surface which encloses a volume) wherein said antenna is arranged inside said upper cover (figure 2a clearly shows dotted lines indicating the antenna item 240 inside the housing also see column 6, lines 33-42), wherein the input device further comprises: a communicating part provided to said case and supplying transmission signal to said antenna, and wherein said antenna is detachably connected to said communicating part by a connector (figure 2b, items 235, 245a and 245b and see column 6, lines 18-32 and further the term "detachably" is viewed broadly because part of the antenna is attached at connection points 245a and 245b by some means such as pressure or solder and in the case of solder, a solder gun would have been simply used to detach it and therefore this reference clearly anticipated the mere functional recitation of the antenna being "detachably").

With regard to claim 2, Schneider teaches the input device as claimed in claim 1, wherein said antenna is made from a conductive wire rod (inherent feature of an antenna because it must conduct a signal).

With regard to claim 3, Schneider teaches the input device as claimed in claim 1, wherein said antenna is formed by printing a conductor on the upper surface inside said housing (See abstract "The first portion and the second portion form an antenna loop. The first portion may be etched on a printed circuit board").

With regard to claim 6, Schneider teaches the input device as claimed in claim 4, wherein said input part is detachably connected to said communicating part by a connector (inherent feature for example the wheel or buttons on this mouse must

Art Unit: 2675

connect to the communicating part and it is inherent that parts that connect can also be capable of disconnect or disassembly therefore broadly reading on "detachably connected").

With regard to claim 11, Schneider teaches a wireless input device to be manipulated by a user (figure 2a, item 210) and, wherein the input unit comprises: a case; an upper cover that is connected to the case to form an inside volume (figure 2a, item 215 teaches the outer surface of the device with electronics an antenna inside and since there is a solid line running semi vertical on the surface, let left of line be called the cover and right of line be called case and further it is inherent that there would be a means of getting the electronics inside the surface which encloses a volume) ; and an antenna, which is located at an uppermost portion of the inside volume (figure 2a clearly shows dotted lines indicating the antenna item 240 inside the housing and column 5, lines 20-65), to wirelessly transmit a radio wave that comprises coordinate data to a receiving unit that is connected to a processing unit connector (figure 2b, items 235, and figure 1a , items 130 and 110 and figure 1b item 110).

With regard to claim 12, Schneider teaches the wireless input device of claim 11, further comprising: a radio transmitting circuit board that is contained within the inside volume (figure 2b, item 235), wherein the antenna is a conductive wire rod that is connected to the radio transmitting circuit board at only one end of the conductive wire rod (figure 2b, items 245a and 245b , inherent feature of an antenna because it must conduct a signal).

With regard to claim 13, Schneider teaches the wireless input device of claim 11, wherein the antenna is formed by a printed wiring method on an underside of the upper cover (See abstract "The first portion and the second portion form an antenna loop. The first portion may be etched on a printed circuit board" column 6, lines 32-42 which reads on this broad language of being on the underside of the upper cover see figure 2a , items 215 and 220).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider et al. (6,356,243).

With regard to dependent claims 7-10 which all depend on canceled claim 5 Schneider does not teach specific common standard transmitting methods such as Amplitude Shift Keying (ASK), Frequency Shift Keying (FSK), Phase Shift Keying (PSK) and Spread Spectrum Communication (SSC). However such transmitting methods as broadly claimed are each well known in the prior art (Examiner declares OFFICIAL NOTICE) and each are capable of being used by Schneider so therefore this recitation is viewed as merely directed towards an "OBVIOUS INTENDED USE" of the mouse antenna because Schneider must use one of the transmitting methods cited and one is motivated to use one or the other based on environment of operation and availability of parts and cost of those parts. The fact that so many transmitting methods

Art Unit: 2675

ASK, FSK, PSK and SSC are claimed may suggest that the specific transmitting method is not critical to practice of the apparatus.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Liu et al. (6,445,379) clearly teaches in figure 1 that it is well known for a wireless mouse to have an upper cover item 21 and a case item 22 holding the electronics which facilitate assembly of different components.

8. Applicant's arguments filed 12/5/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues on page 6, with regard to independent claims 1 and 11, "Schneider does not disclose or suggest that the antenna is inside the upper cover or at the uppermost portion of the inside volume".

The examiner disagrees and references the more detailed rejection above.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2675

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Bell whose telephone number is (703) 306-3019.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377 can help with any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application.


Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or Faxed to: (703) 872-9306

Or Hand-delivered to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor
(Receptionist)


Paul Bell
Art unit 2675
February 10, 2004


CHANH NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER